was increased from 0.3% to 0.36%, effective January 1, 1996, in Resolution T-15801 on October 5, 1995. The high cost fund changed also to 0.27% per Resolution T-15826 on December 20, 1995. These changes must be reflected in the compliance tariff filings.

2. CLCs must amend their tariffs to state which of the following incumbent providers they intend to use to administer the deaf and disabled equipment distribution program: Pacific, GTEC, the California Telephone Association (CTA), or Thomson Consulting which performs program functions for CTA.

3. CLCs must concur in the limitation of liability tariffs of either Pacific or GTEC, as they appear in Appendices B and C of D.95-12-057.

Staff's review of tariff corrections filed in response to deficiency letters shows that some deficiencies have not been fully corrected. Appendix C includes a list of specific deficiencies, some generally applicable to all petitioners, others by company, which must be corrected as part of each petitioner's tariff compliance filing on or before February 29, 1996. Approved CLCs are also authorized to amend their tariffs to reflect the wholesale prices and services adopted in today's companion order regarding CLC wholesale rates.

IV. Approval of Resale Tariff Terms and Conditions Other Than Rates

Pacific and GTEC each filed proposed resale tariffs for terms and conditions other than rates on October 2, 1995, as directed by the August 18, 1995, ALJ ruling. The reasonableness of the LEC's proposed wholesale rates was addressed separately through testimony offered in evidentiary hearings. Parties filed comments on the LECs' proposed resale tariffs' nonrate terms and conditions on October 23 and reply comments on November 27, 1995. In the companion decision before us today addressing wholesale rates, we define the range of services for which competitive resale shall apply and restrictions on CLC resale of LEC services. In this instant decision, we address the remaining issues concerning terms and conditions applicable to the competitive resale of local exchange service. Pacific and GTEC should incorporate the directives in this decision as well as in the companion decision on CLC wholesale rates in making their resale tariff compliance filings.

A. Position of Coalition

The Coalition argues that Pacific and GTEC be required to amend their resale tariffs to provide for certain operational interfaces. The Coalition contends these operational interfaces are required to enable resellers to offer the same service quality as the LECs offer to their own end-users and to ensure that service ordering, provisioning and repair intervals are no longer than those which LEC customers experience. The Coalition claims that the costs of implementing these interfaces will be largely borne by the CLCs themselves who would build to the specifications of the LECs' current ordering, provisioning, and maintenance systems. The Coalition expresses doubt that the necessary operational interfaces are likely to be established through negotiations between CLCs and LECs, and requests that the Commission order the LECs to implement five key operational interfaces to enable resale competition to begin on March 1, 1996.

The Coalition contends that the following five operational interfaces be specified in Pacific's and GTEC's resale tariffs, as follows:[3]

1. Preservice Ordering:

   The Coalition seeks access to LEC systems containing information on customers' current service profiles, service and feature availability, telephone number availability and assignment, and scheduling the installation of services and any necessary equipment.

2. Service Ordering and Provisioning:

   This refers to the transmission of data to enable the incumbent LEC to fill the customer's order. The Coalition states that the reseller's service order must be accurately and promptly executed by the LEC so that the reseller can give firm commitment dates for local service to its customers.

3. Access to directory listing and databases:

   The Coalition believes that database access is necessary to allow resellers to add, modify, or delete directory listings for customers in the LEC's directory database to insure complete and properly updated customer information.

4. Access to online monitoring systems:

   The Coalition believes that CLCs require access to the LECs' on-line systems monitoring the network, isolating trouble spots, performing network tests, and scheduling repair dispatch to ensure prompt

3 Sprint does not believe the proposed five key operational interfaces are essential to the development of resale competition of some form.

and efficient repair and maintenance comparable to that of the LECs.

5. Daily usage data on a line-specific basis:

   The Coalition believes that standardized daily usage data is necessary for the reseller's billing and invoicing functions in an accurate manner.

The Coalition advocates that in addition to these operational areas, measurements be established to assess that the quality of performance at all points of interface between the incumbent LEC and the reseller is comparable to the quality of the LECs' retail operations. The Coalition denies that the LECs will need to develop any new systems in order to implement the proposed operational interfaces. The only cost which the LECs would incur, according to the Coalition, is for installation of security systems to protect the confidentiality of customer records.

The Coalition further asks that the following terms and conditions be required in the LECs' resale tariffs:

1. Free DA Calling Allowance:

   The Coalition seeks a five free DA call allowance per month, as is currently provided to Pacific's end-users.

2. Fraud Adjustments:

   While Pacific currently investigates customer fraud complaints for its own retail customers, it does not intend to perform these functions on behalf of the CLC. Accordingly, the Coalition believes that the CLC wholesale price should be reduced accordingly

3. CLC Branding Limitations:

   The Coalition objects to GTEC's proposed limitation prohibiting a CLC from

> branding[4] GTEC's intraLocal Access Transport Area (LATA) toll service. The Coalition argues that any branding by the incumbent LEC of a CLC reseller's services would severely diminish the competitive effectiveness of the reseller's service offering. Time Warner, in contrast, believes that a facilities-based CLC should be encouraged to preserve and promote its own branded service and not be required to allow rebranding.

B. Position of Pacific and GTEC

Pacific objects to providing free DA allowances. Pacific objects to providing database access regarding services and features available in each central office and regarding the service history of particular customers on the basis of technical feasibility and confidentiality concerns.

While Pacific agrees to provide necessary operational interfaces, Pacific objects to including the technical details of the interfaces in its tariff. Pacific argues that tariffs do not normally include such detailed technical information, and that it would be needlessly cumbersome if tariffs had to be modified every time operational interfaces changed. Pacific proposes that the Commission merely set up operational standards and monitor their compliance.

GTEC argues that the Coalition's request regarding the five operational interface areas is unnecessary and inappropriate. GTEC views the Coalition's proposal as providing an enormous competitive advantage to CLCs who would have unfettered ability to scan GTEC databases and records to target good marketing opportunities using confidential GTEC customer information. GTEC

4 CLC branding refers to the identifications of the CLC as the provider of the toll service in contrast to GTEC. Thus a customer's bill would show the CLC as the provider of the service.

argues that any information needs of a CLC can be satisfied through an electronic interface process which provides the controls GTEC needs, while satisfying CLC concerns. In its proposed tariff, GTEC proposes that resale service orders be placed utilizing a standard Access Service Request.

C. Discussion

CLCs will need access to various LEC operational support systems in order to engage in viable competition as competitive resellers of local exchange service. We agree with Pacific, however, that the detailed exposition of the means by which such systems will be provisioned is not appropriate subject matter for the resale tariffs. We believe the guidelines under which such interfaces should be provided are more efficiently addressed in our adopted interim rules regarding intercompany arrangements as discussed below. We also recognize that certain aspects of the implementation of necessary intercompany arrangements should be examined further in the context of technical workshops, as we discuss below.

We agree with the Coalition that the free DA call allowance per month should be provided to CLC resellers in the same manner it is provided to LEC end-users. In this manner, CLCs will not be placed at a competitive disadvantage relative to the LECs in the ability to offer end-users DA service. We direct the LECs to revise their resale tariffs accordingly.

Regarding the Coalition proposal for fraud adjustments, we have adopted a reseller discount in today's companion decision in recognition of LEC retailing functions which will be taken over by the CLC. The adopted discount addresses the Coalition's request for a rate discount to compensate for CLCs taking over LEC fraud investigation functions.

Consistent with our policy of generally removing restrictions on the resale of LEC retail services, we decline to adopt GTEC's proposal to restrict CLCs' ability to brand GTEC's intraLATA toll service. We believe such restriction would unduly impede the development of a competitive market. We direct GTEC to remove this restriction from its resale tariff.

V. Phase II Rulemaking Issues

A. Overview

In the following section, we review parties' comments regarding the proposed rules set forth in our April 26, 1995, Order subject to Phase II of this proceeding and determine the appropriate interim rules to be adopted governing these issues to become effective March 1, 1996. Consistent with our policy adopted in D.95-12-056, we favor mutual negotiation among CLCs and LECs as the preferred approach to determining necessary arrangements for competitive local exchange service, and we reflect this preference in the rules adopted below. We also recognize that a number of the disputes raised in parties comments indicate the need for further examination. Accordingly, where appropriate, we make provision for technical workshops and/or further comments as a basis for subsequent rulemaking.

In D.95-12-056, we adopted an approach which relied on parties' flexibility to negotiate mutually agreeable terms and conditions of interconnection. We also recognized the parties' concerns, however, that in structured negotiations, one side or the other may be perceived as having too much bargaining power. To promote a fair balance in such negotiations, our adopted rules for interconnection prescribed a set of "preferred outcomes," based on parties' comments about what technical features lead to the most efficient and economic interconnection solutions. We stated that in approving interconnection contracts, the Commission staff would consider how well a contract achieves the "preferred outcomes," but would not reject mutually agreeable contracts which do not contain preferred outcomes and which are not unduly discriminatory and anticompetitive.

We shall apply a consistent approach with respect to negotiations covering additional intercompany arrangements as covered in the interim rules being adopted in today's order To the extent the rules call for parties to enter into negotiations for various intercompany arrangements as outlined herein, we will consider how well the agreements meet the preferred outcomes as specified in the rules. Again, we will not reject mutually agreeable contracts, however, which do not contain preferred outcomes but are not unduly discriminatory and anticompetitive. Likewise, in the event parties are unable to reach agreement on intercompany arrangements, we shall authorize them to seek expedited resolution through our Dispute Resolution Procedures as outlined in D.95-12-056.

Our adopted rules governing the issues discussed below are set forth in Appendix D. To facilitate comparison of changes between our proposed April 26, 1995, draft rules with the revised version of the rules which we adopt herein, we have highlighted the text additions and stricken through the text deletions in Appendix D. In the discussion below, the rule numbers refer to the numbering sequence used in the April 26 order.

B. Joint Provisioning of Switched Carrier Access Services

1. Introduction

Meet-point billing arrangements are important to enable CLCs to operate as full service local phone companies, including the ability to originate and terminate long distance calls. To provide this capability, CLCs must have access to the hundreds of long distance providers that offer service in California.

There are two ways in which CLCs can obtain access to IECs: 1) through direct trunk interconnections with all IECs; or 2) through meet-point trunking arrangements with the incumbent LEC. The arrangement by which one carrier accesses IECs through another carrier's tandem is known as joint provisioning of switched access services, or meet-point arrangements. Our April 26, 1995, proposed Rule 9 for switched carrier access services provided that:

> CLCs and LECs shall establish meet-point billing arrangements to enable CLCs to provide Switched Access Services to third parties via LEC access tandems in accordance with the Meet-Point Billing and Provisioning Guidelines adopted by the Ordering and Billing Forum, subject to the following requirements:
>
> A. CLC and LEC shall arrange for CLC to subtend the LEC access tandem which the LEC's own end offices that serve the same NXX Service Area subtend for the provision of Switched Access Services.
>
> B. At CLC's election, the meet-point connection for the tandem subtending arrangement shall be established at the CLC's NXX rating point, at a collocation facility maintained by the CLC (or the CLC's chosen transport vendor), at the LEC access tandem, or at any point mutually agreed to by CLC and LEC.
>
> C. Common channel signaling shall be utilized in connection with meet-point billing arrangements to the extent available.
>
> D. CLC and LEC shall maintain provisions in their respective Federal and State access tariffs sufficient to reflect this meet-point billing arrangement and meet-point billing percentages.
>
> E. CLC and LEC shall exchange all call detail records associated with switched access traffic provided via the meet-point billing arrangement in a timely fashion, as necessary to accurately and reliably rate and bill third parties for such traffic. LECs shall produce carriers access bills for the CLCs' meet-point traffic, using the single bill format, unless the LEC has been specifically authorized by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to employ the multiple bill method.

2. **Parties' Positions**

The Coalition states that the only efficient way to provide end-user access to all IECs is to provide CLCs access, under the same meet-point arrangements as the independent LECs enjoy, to the IECs to whom the CLCs are not directly connected. The Coalition objects to a number of changes in this rule as proposed by Pacific and GTEC.

The Coalition objects to reliance on the mutually arranged practices which have historically existed between carriers, since local exchange competition will reflect an environment where no single carrier will have a monopoly. The Coalition recommends that all meet-point arrangements follow the meet-point billing guidelines, including contractual arrangements. The Coalition proposes modification of Rule 9A to be consistent with the process for ordering NXX codes and for designating the tandem which the end office subtends for each NXX.

The Coalition objects to giving the LECs the authority to decide where meet-point arrangements should occur. The Coalition believes that CLCs should designate the meet-point interconnection if agreement cannot be reached. The Coalition proposes that two-way trunks be required for provisioning meet-point services. The Coalition proposes that the LEC provide a list of each IEC that connects to it using MF rather than SS7 signalling. The Coalition proposes that the CLC have the flexibility to use either the single bill or multiple bill format for carrier access bills for the CLCs' meet-point traffic.

Pacific objects to the Coalition's proposed rule regarding billing options, arguing that it is inconsistent with the Multiple Exchange Carrier Access Billing (MECAB) guidelines which the CLCs, in earlier comments, had agreed should be applied to govern the joint provisioning of switched access. The MECAB guidelines are the result of industry negotiations through the Industry and Billing Forum, and provide that the choice of billing method is subject to negotiation between the parties with the multiple bill as the default option. Pacific opposes the single bill option because it normally places the CLC in the role of billing agent. Pacific prefers not to have a competitor billing Pacific's IEC customers on its behalf.

GTEC recommends that any rule concerning meet-point billing and joint provisioning of access services should support the mutually arranged practices which have historically existed between carriers, and which continue today. GTEC states that many of these practices are derived from the Order and Billing Forum (OBF), which is an industry-wide organization that develops industry guidelines on a consensus basis. GTEC believes that deviation from existing practices will cause unnecessary expenditures and duplication of network facilities. GTEC adds that its recommendation allows parties to work out any specific technical details that are associated with joint provisioning.

Citizens believes that neither the LEC nor the CLC should be allowed to determine the meet-point connection point unilaterally. If the parties cannot agree, then Citizens proposes that they petition the Commission for resolution of the dispute on an expedited basis. Citizens believes all parties should have the option of the multiple bill method.

DRA does not object to the Commission's proposed rule for meet-point billing for switched access services, given the Commission's adoption of the bill-and-keep mechanism for termination compensation during the interim phase of competition.

3. Discussion

We agree that neither LECs or CLCs should be able to determine meet-point arrangements unilaterally. Accordingly, consistent with our stated preference for negotiated agreements as discussed in D.95-12-056, we shall direct LECs and CLCs to establish reciprocal meet-point billing arrangements through mutual agreement. Parties' dispute over the merits of single versus multiple billing formats should be examined in a technical workshop before we decide on which option should be considered a preferred outcome. We provide a schedule for such workshops in the order below. We adopt rules for switched access services as set forth in Appendix D, Section 9.

C. Information and Mass Announcement Services

1. Introduction

In our Order of April 26, 1995, we proposed Rule 10 to govern the LEC's provisioning of information services. The text of Rule 10 was as follows:

> A. Whenever a LEC operates an information services platform (e.g., 976 service) over which information services are delivered to its own end-users located within an area also served by one or more CLCs, the LEC shall purchase originating access service and billing and collection service from each CLC in the area. Such access, billing and collection service shall be identical to the access, billing and collection services the CLC provides to the IECs for the delivery of calls to the interexchange carriers' 900 information service platforms.
>
> B. To the extent a CLC offers an information service platform over which information service providers may offer information services, the LEC shall offer, and the CLC shall purchase arrangements analogous to those described in (A) above.
>
> C. If a CLC provides access to an information services platform (e.g., 976 services), the CLC must conform to the rules in D.91-03-021 as identified for IECs.

Proposed Rules 10A and B address the provisions for passing 900-type calls between networks originating such calls and networks operating information service platforms.

2. **Parties' Positions**

The Coalition believes that if the LECs offer 976, 900, or similar services, CLCs reselling that LEC's service should be required to offer and implement the same options provided by the incumbent LEC. Similarly, the Coalition expects the LECs to offer reciprocal arrangements for the end-user as relayed by the reseller.

The Coalition expects the LECs to provide timely and accurate billing information to the other carrier to allow for proper billing to the end-use customer. The Coalition proposes an interim billing charge for NXX-based calls of five cents per call. Pacific is agreeable to this suggested charge. (Pacific Reply Comments, p. 43.)

Pacific states that if two-way trunks, or other facilities that do not pass the caller's automatic number identification (ANI), are used for CLC interconnection, the necessary ANI detail will not be passed to Pacific's 900 central office. Consequently, Pacific will lack the capability of tracking and billing the call to the information provider. In this instance, Pacific requests that a complete call record be provided by the CLC so that Pacific can record the call. Pacific explains that calls to its 900 prefix need to be routed the same as 976, calls over the intraLATA trunk group. This will entail a minor switch translation by the CLCs.

GTEC states that it does not operate information services platforms, and its role in the provision of information access services (IAS) is limited to providing customer access to the information providers' (IPs) equipment, or "platform," and to providing billing and collection services to IPs through tariffs or contracts. GTEC believes that CLCs wishing to offer their end-users access to IAS and interconnection of IP platforms to the public switched network should be required to establish IAS access tariffs similar to those in place for existing LECs and IECs. GTEC also believes that CLCs must establish their own billing and collection tariffs or contracts with IPs offering services to the CLC customers. Likewise, GTEC believes that compensation and charges for end-user traffic that passes between the networks of LECs and CLCs and terminates on an IP's platform should be governed by the same rules currently in place for existing LECs and IECs.

DRA recommends no changes to the Commission's proposed rules for information services.

3. Discussion

As set forth in D.95-12-056, we have adopted two-way trunking as a preferred outcome in mutual interconnection agreements. Accordingly, we shall amend Rule 10A to require CLCs who interconnect, other than over one-way trunks, to provide the LEC with a complete call record of all calls originating on the CLCs network and directed to the LEC's information service platform. We conclude that a technical workshop should be convened to address the future role of the LECs in providing billing and collecting for Information Provider services.

No party objected to Proposed Rules 10B and C and we shall adopt them without change.

D. Additional Intercompany Arrangements

Our April 26, 1995, order included proposed rules governing intercompany arrangements as set forth in Rule 11. In D.95-12-056, we adopted interim rules governing intercompany arrangements with respect to 611 and E-911 service. For purposes of this decision, we shall continue the 611 and E-911 rules in place without further change or expansion. We address below the remaining issues relating to intercompany arrangements, as set forth in the proposed interim rules of April 26, 1995. We focus our discussion on those proposed rules where parties expressed disagreement or suggested changes. For those proposed rules where no disagreement was noted, we shall adopt those rules without change or further discussion. Our adopted rules for intercompany arrangements are set forth in Appendix D, Section 11. The numerical references below are to the numbered sections in the April 26, 1995, proposed rules.

1. Service Ordering

a. Introduction

Rule 11.A contained In Appendix A of the Commission's Order of April 26, 1995, proposed the following requirement pertaining to service ordering and implementation:

> A. LECs shall put into place a service ordering and implementation scheduling system for use by the CLCs which is equivalent to that used by the LECs and their affiliates. Data pertaining to service and facility availability shall be made available to CLCs in the same manner as it is provided to the LECs. In addition to the General Order 133(b) requirement to report held orders for end-user service, LECs shall separately report held orders related to orders placed by CLCs

b. Parties' Positions

The Coalition argues that CLC resellers will have to rely on the ordering systems and processes of the dominant LECs against which they compete. To prevent the LECs from providing inferior service ordering capabilities to the CLCs, the Coalition proposes that the Commission require that LEC installation intervals for resold services and unbundled loops be no longer than those for the LECs' own customers The Coalition believes that service ordering arrangements should comport with an overall regulatory structure which treats CLCs and LECs as co-carriers, rather than as a customer-server relationship. The Coalition argues that the LECs recover any implementation costs of intercompany arrangements as a general cost of doing business, just as the LECs treat their costs to provide each other the necessary arrangements to ensure interconnection and mutual cooperation in providing services between each others' customers.

Pacific agrees to provide the CLCs with timely and efficient operational interfaces for service and preservice ordering at least equivalent to what it currently offers to its end-users. Pacific believes that CLC interface needs may differ from those of existing users and that significant costs may be incurred to develop new interfaces. Pacific is developing a PC-based electronic interface product called "OAI Office" which is intended to accommodate CLCs' service order and repair needs. Pacific requests, however, that consumer privacy rights and data integrity of its proprietary operational support system be protected. Pacific offers to provide CLCs with add-and-delete capability through a batch data download system, available on a 24-hour basis. Pacific objects, however, to providing real-time on-line direct access to its listing databases, due to concerns over security, accuracy, and confidentiality issues.

Pacific objects to the Coalition's proposal that reciprocal intercompany arrangements be handled by interconnecting companies at no charge, under the Coalition's theory that costs for each side would be about the same. Pacific notes that the arrangements between the LEC and other telephone companies reflect a historical arrangement between carriers serving different territories and not competing with one another. Pacific asserts that the lack of compensation from other noncompeting carriers was less of an issue in the past, because other arrangements were in place allowing Pacific to recover its costs. Pacific argues that no such arrangements for cost recovery exist with the CLCs, and thus all costs of intercompany arrangements should be determined and assessed to the company causing the costs.

GTEC states that it should not be forced to incur the expense of putting into place a different service order or implementation scheduling system for CLCs. GTEC believes that doing so would provide an unwarranted preference to CLCs over other end-user customers. GTEC further believes that its existing legal obligation to not discriminate between customers should be sufficient to assure that CLCs receive fair and equal service ordering and implementation. GTEC opposes CLCs being allowed access to proprietary service and facility information, or access to the facilities databases which GTEC states are proprietary to the LEC. GTEC states that this information is not currently provided to other carriers, and it should not be provided to CLCs.

GTEC has not yet developed an electronic interface and, in the meantime, proposes to handle preservice ordering through a Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) process which provides telephone number assignment, scheduling for installation, and other data. GTEC believes its FOC process will also insure that each CLC reseller's service orders are accurately and promptly executed, to enable the reseller to give its customers firm commitment dates for local service.

DRA believes that the provisions of service ordering should be reciprocal among all carriers and subject to tariffed rates. DRA also believes that access to data concerning service and facility availability should be provided via a real-time, on-line link.

c. Discussion

We recognize that adequate service ordering interfaces are necessary to enable CLCs to offer a quality of service which is competitive with that of the LECs. We shall not dictate the precise technical specifications of such interfaces but rather shall provide the flexibility for carriers to enter into agreements tailored to their specific needs and consistent with the technical capabilities of the LECs. We prefer agreements which minimize costs to both parties and minimize any other barriers to entry. We shall require, however, that the LECs provide an automated on-line service ordering system for use by the CLCs. We further conclude that additional information is needed to develop appropriate requirements for monthly reporting of service order provisioning by the LECs. We shall direct CACD to convene a workshop to examine these requirements and to prepare a report. Any interim agreements reached by parties regarding service ordering are subject to any subsequent provisions which we may adopt following the technical workshops.

We shall not preclude either the LECs or the CLCs from being compensated for providing necessary service ordering interfaces, and shall direct that compensation be determined by mutual agreement.

2. **Billing and Collection**

a. **Introduction**

Rule 11.C of the April 26, 1995 Order proposed the following requirement pertaining to billing and collection agreements.

> C. LECs and CLCs shall be required to enter into mutual billing and collection agreements so that each telecommunications service provider can accept another service provider's telephone line number and other non-proprietary calling cards and can bill collect on third party calls to a number served by another provider.

b. **Parties' Positions**

The Coalition proposes that adopted rules should ensure that signalling and answer/disconnect supervision are provided to allow for proper billing of customer calls. The Coalition calls for the reciprocal sharing of billing data and the identity of which carriers interconnect at each specific tandem in order to facilitate efficient meet-point billing and collection of end-user charges. Regional Bell Operating Companies (RBOCs) and independent telephone companies (ITCs) currently use the "Centralized Message Distribution System" (CMDS) to bill and settle messages between carriers for interLATA calls which are not originated, terminated, and billed within a single LEC's service area. The Coalition argues that CLCs should be subject to the CMDS and similar settlement arrangements, consistent with the co-carrier paradigm.

The Coalition wants the LECs to provide CLCs with daily usage data in a standardized industry format, and on a line specific basis for resold local exchange service. The Coalition further seeks CLC access to the LECs' switch systems, or software utilized to determine local calling areas, so that calls for the same local calling areas can be accurately rated and billed.

Pacific agrees with the Coalition that mutual billing and collection relationships between all local exchange providers in California will facilitate accurate billing of end-users and will be in all providers' best interests. Pacific will be in a position to support this relationship with CLCs as a CMDS Host or, if another RBOC is selected as a host, via CMDS to their host of choice. Pacific will utilize industry standard "Exchange Message Records" (EMR) in the same manner as is currently used for independent LECs.

Pacific states that new processes will be required in order to implement the Coalition's proposal that the LECs identify which carriers are interconnected at each specific tandem. Pacific further believes disclosure of such information could be deemed proprietary by the IECs. Pacific proposes that the CLCs request from the IECs whatever information the CLC needs to establish proper billing arrangements.

Pacific objects to the Coalition's request for access to LEC software to determine local calling areas. Pacific believes that its published tariffs provide sufficient disclosure of local calling area prefixes so that CLCs will be able to develop necessary databases.

Pacific proposes to charge CLCs for busy line verification/interrupt (BLV/I) processing at the rate for BLVs currently in Pacific's 175-T tariff. Independent companies and

CLCs would be charged equally for this service when competition starts. Pacific proposes that the CLCs be instructed to submit tariff proposals indicating how such calls are to be sent to them.

GTEC believes that both LECs and CLCs should be required to enter into mutual billing and collection agreements, but recommends that the Commission proposed Rule 11.C be modified to incorporate the concepts of mutuality and reciprocity.

DRA proposes that this rule reflect reciprocity among carriers, subject to tariffed arrangements.

c. **Discussion**

We agree that CLCs need access to the information contained in various LEC operation and support systems databases, such as those used to validate calling cards, and that billing and collection arrangements should be reciprocal among all carriers. We conclude that parties comments raise various technical issues concerning the appropriate procedures for billing and collection which can best be addressed through technical workshops. In the meantime, we shall expect parties to negotiate mutually acceptable agreements for billing and collection which enable each service provider to accept another provider's telephone line number and other nonproprietary calling cards and to bill collect on third party calls to a number served by another provider.

3. Inclusion of CLC Customers in LEC DA Databases

a. **Introduction**

Rule 11.D.(1) of the April 26, 1995, Order, proposed the following requirement regarding the inclusion of CLC customers in LEC DA databases:

> (1) CLCs shall compensate the LECs for their cost of including the CLCs' customers in the directory assistance database and for any other related maintenance cost of directory assistance database in the provisioning of 411 services for the CLCs.

b. <u>Parties' Positions</u>

The LECs currently maintain DA databases for their respective service territories. The Coalition supports having a single database which contains all listed phone numbers of LECs' and CLCs' subscribers so that all telecommunications users can acquire information from a single and complete source. The Coalition proposes that, in exchange for CLCs making their listings available to the LECs, the LECs provide a single standard white pages and yellow pages listing for each CLC customer at no charge to CLCs or their customers.

Pacific believes that all telephone companies within California should be required to license their directory listing information, upon request, to all interested parties at fair and reasonable rates, subject to appropriate terms and conditions to protect consumer privacy. Pacific agrees to accept CLC listing information and include it, without charge to the CLC, in Pacific's DA database and Pacific's white page listing database. Pacific would impose an additional charge for non-basic caption listings or additional listings. Pacific would provide DA service to CLC end-user customers pursuant to Pacific's access tariff (175-T, Section 9). A CLC could provide its own DA service and obtain Pacific's listings through Pacific's Reproduction Rights tariff (Schedule Cal. A. 5.7.4). Pacific Bell Directory (PBD) would include a single line listing in the yellow pages for the CLC's business end-users, also without charge. Additional advertising could be purchased from PBD directly

Pacific believes the rule should make it clear that the LECs will be able to charge the CLCs for DA services. The Coalition argues that all alternative forms of DA access be provided at TSLRIC to prevent anticompetitive price discrimination. The Coalition believes that LECs should provide access to databases at no charge to CLCs until the LECs have filed, and the Commission has approved, TSLRIC studies of the essential monopoly function of providing on-line access to DA databases and updates. (10/10 Comments, pg. 8.)

DRA concurs with the Commission's April 26, 1995 proposed rule regarding directory listings.

c. **Discussion**

We conclude that Pacific's proposal for inclusion of CLC customers in LEC DA databases and compensation arrangements is reasonable and should be adopted. Queries to the 411 database shall be charged at the applicable tariff rate, except for standard allowances for customers of resellers. We shall direct the CLCs and LECs to enter into mutually satisfactory agreements governing appropriate compensation for the inclusion of CLCs' customers in the DA database and for any other related maintenance cost of the DA database in the provisioning of 411 services for the CLCs.

4. **Access to LEC Databases**

a. **Introduction**

Rule 11.D.(3) contained in Appendix A of the Commission's Order of April 26, 1995, proposed the following requirement pertaining to CLC access to LEC databases:

> (3) CLCs shall be provided access to all LEC service databases, e.g., 800 Line Information Data Base (LIDB), and Advanced Intelligent Network (AIN). CLC access to and use of such databases shall be through signaling interconnection, with functionality and quality equal to that received by LECs and their affiliates at nondiscriminatory tariffed rate.

In order to offer competitive local exchange service, CLCs must have access to those LEC databases which are essential to the provision of basic local exchange service.

b. **Parties' Positions**

Pacific operates network databases for two purposes: 800 service number screening and routing, and line information and calling card validation (known as the Line Information Database, LIDB). Both databases are accessed using the Signalling System Seven (SS7) network by various network switches in Pacific's network. (10/10 Comments, pg. 56.) Pacific agrees to offer SS7 network interconnection with all CLCs, as it currently does with other telecommunications service providers. Through this SS7 network, CLCs can send queries to Pacific's network databases in the same manner as Pacific's own end offices do. Pacific proposes to charge tariffed rates currently in effect for other interconnecting carriers with the same functionality, for each 800 call or LIDB query directed to Pacific.[5] The exception would be for 800 calls that are eventually routed to another carrier, in which case Pacific would bill the 800 service provider, not the CLC.

GTEC states that LEC 800 and LIDB databases are essentially storage databases for customer information. GTEC is concerned that customer privacy be protected when allowing CLCs access to LEC databases. GTEC is also concerned that unrestricted access to LEC databases could impair network integrity and the security of its databases. Accordingly, GTEC recommends that a CLC should be allowed to obtain only information which pertains to the CLC's customers or information that is necessary for network routing and call management purposes.

The Coalition argues that LECs should be required to provide CLCs with access to necessary databases on the same terms and conditions as they provide access to themselves. The Coalition claims that CLCs will need access to the DA databases either through resale of the information by passing 411 traffic to the

5 For 800 database queries, Pacific will charge its tariffed rate of $0.00479 cents per query specified in CPUC 175T, Section 6.8.10. LIDB access is provided at the rate of $0.02630 per query under FCC Tariff 128T, Section 6.8.9.

LEC, CLC purchase of the actual DA database, or on-line query access of the LEC DA database.

The Coalition argues that CLCs must be assured that LECs will route 800 calls for CLCs as part of switched access meet-point billing arrangements, to avoid wasteful or duplicative alternatives. The Coalition believes that any charge for the database query should be levied against the toll carrier, not the CLC.

DRA concurs with the Commission's proposed rule.

c. __Discussion__

We shall adopt during the interim Pacific's proposed revision to Proposed Rule 11.D.(3) that CLCs be provided access to database services rather than to the proprietary databases, themselves. We conclude that, for now, access to the services will meet CLCs' needs in servicing their own customers while protecting proprietary concerns of the LECs.

We believe, however, that in a competitive environment all carriers should be on the same terms. We ask parties to consider whether customer databases should be controlled by an independent third party, in the same way that a neutral NPA administrator is to be selected via workshop. We shall accordingly schedule a workshop in Phase III of this proceeding to consider measures to ensure reciprocal access to data consistent with applicable proprietary rights

5. __Access to Signalling Protocols__

a. __Introduction__

Rule 11.E of the Commission's Order of April 26, 1995, proposed the following requirement regarding CLCs' access to LEC signaling networks:

> E. LECs shall make available access to all signalling protocols and all elements of signalling protocols used in the routing of local and interexchange traffic, including

> signalling protocols used in the query of call processing databases, and shall make available all signalling resources and information necessary for the routing of local and interexchange traffic. LECs shall be prohibited from interfering in the transmission of signalling information between customers and interconnected carriers, and may not claim proprietary right to signalling protocols or elements of signalling protocols.

b. **Parties' Positions**

Pacific proposes to modify the rule to reflect that all signalling protocols and elements used to route local and interexchange traffic should be identical to the protocols used by others, in accordance with current industry-standard network interface requirements.

GTEC supports allowing CLCs access to the SS7 network. GTEC believes that the best way to accomplish this is through interconnection via mediated access at the signal transfer points (STP) which GTEC states would allow all providers to self-provision the service switching point (SSP) and the associated signalling link between the SSP and the STP. GTEC believes that mediated access will protect the integrity of the SS7 network and also protect confidential customer information.

c. **Discussion**

We shall make this rule reciprocal for both LECs and CLCs and shall direct that all such signalling protocols be provided in a manner equivalent to the LECs' provision to themselves and other LECs.

6. **Operator Services (Rule 11.F)**

Pacific states that operator assistance services are competitive and, as such, any rule requiring one carrier to provide such service to other carriers is unnecessary. Pacific proposes